

Clay County Schools

# Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Clay School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>28</b>

## Florida Cyber Charter Academy At Clay

9143 PHILLIPS HWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

<http://flva.k12.com>

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Ensuring all students reach their full potential by utilizing a highly effective curriculum and implementing classes that are student-centered, data driven, and engaging for all learners.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Celebrating diversity and building community through inspiration while ensuring our students are productive citizens today for success in their future endeavors of tomorrow.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Canter, Angie	Principal	Principal of the High School will share out the School Improvement Plan and delegate the required trainings to the academic coaches and intervention teachers. She will complete data digs and analyze data to monitor progress in PLCs and Subject level meetings.
D'Esposito, Kerrie	Principal	Principal of the Middle School will share out the School Improvement Plan with faculty and delegate the required trainings to the academic coaches and intervention teachers. She will complete data digs and analyze data to monitor progress in PLCs and Subject level meetings.
Hulshult, Jerry	Other	
green, Page	Math Coach	The Math coach will plan trainings for new math initiatives and facilitate PLCs and data digs to analyze student success and monitor growth.
Haberstro, Kristan	Reading Coach	The Literacy coach will plan trainings for new initiatives and facilitate PLCs and data digs to analyze student success and monitor growth.

#### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Plan development includes data from surveys from teachers, parents, and students.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP Leadership Team will meet after each assessment period, 3 times a year, to review data and monitor progress toward School Improvement Plan. Administrators will complete walkthroughs and formal evaluations throughout the school year to monitor the implementation of the instructional practices in our priority focus. The team will filter and analyze data specific to our ESSA subgroups to ensure our B/AA students are making adequate progress and adjust interventions as needed.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	57%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	5%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C  2019-20: C  2018-19: C  2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### Early Warning Systems

**Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	6	

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	7

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

#### **Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**



Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55	52	53	53	54	55	52		
ELA Learning Gains				54			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50					
Math Achievement*	29	56	55	38	34	42	33		
Math Learning Gains				46			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	55	61	52	53	55	54	38		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	74	68	43	50	59	55		
Middle School Acceleration	50	69	70	50	41	51			
Graduation Rate	64	70	74	89	56	50	94		
College and Career Acceleration	24	38	53	5	68	70	25		
ELP Progress		39	55		64	70			

*\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	333
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	64

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	89

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	27	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	60			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	47			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	55			29			55	56	50	64	24	
SWD	38			23							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			24			36				4	
HSP	47			25							2	
MUL	45			9							2	
PAC												
WHT	65			39			80	80			5	
FRL											1	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	53	54	50	38	46		53	43	50	89	5	
SWD	40			30						90		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	36		17	54		27					
HSP	50	50		47	70		50					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	65		45	29		64	67		85	0	
FRL										93	0	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	52	47		33	43		38	55		94	25	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	33		20	36							
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	53	53		38	54		47	50		92	18	
FRL												

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	55%	57%	-2%	50%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	52%	51%	1%	47%	5%
09	2023 - Spring	52%	55%	-3%	48%	4%
04	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	50%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	75%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	62%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	67%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	50%	70%	-20%	55%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	59%	-30%	44%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	51%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	24%	68%	-44%	50%	-26%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	48%	-13%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	73%	-6%	63%	4%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	79%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	77%	-12%	63%	2%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Math: We had new teachers and transitions in the math department. There was a gain in math from the previous year, but compared to our ELA scores, math is significantly lower. Students do not use manipulatives in hand, we have purchased a virtual manipulative program, Braining Camp and Desmos in the middle school. We started using Reflex Math more often mid year last year, and Braining Camp the last quarter. We did see a small increase in points from the previous year. Students struggle with number sense and math fluency.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

Math was our area that saw a significant decline. Our students did not have manipulatives and we were transitioning to new math standards. Our students struggled with number sense and math fluency, since it wasn't a high focus over the past few years.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Math was significantly lower than the state average. Our students are virtual and have had limited math manipulatives and fluency practice. In the last quarter of the school year, we purchased a virtual manipulative program and our scores did slightly increase from last school year in math.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Social Studies and MS Acceleration were the areas that showed the most improvement. Teachers were strategically placed in those areas, and the school increased the availability of accelerated classes.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

Attendance/engagement and students with a significant reading deficit are areas from the EWS that we are concerned with.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

Instructional Practices: Math

School/Community Culture: Attendance/Engagement

ESSA subgroups: Black Students

### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math has been significantly lower than the state average for several years now. FLCCA's average for Clay for the 2023 PM3 was 31% Proficient with the State average at 55% for 3rd-8th Grades.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase the % Proficient in math achievement on the B.E.S.T Standards in grades 3rd-8th by 9 points to achieve a 40% proficient, and demonstrate a 45% in Learning Gains for all students, including those in the bottom quartile.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administrators and academic coaches will complete walkthroughs and formal observations to ensure teachers are using the tools and instructional practices identified in the plan for intervention. SIP Leadership Team will meet after PM1 and PM 2 to compare data, monitor growth, and adjust practices as needed based on that data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

using Nearpod and Desmos to engage students and see their work live, as well as utilize Braining Camp for virtual math manipulatives. FLCCA will also be starting each lesson with number talks to increase students mental math ability and number sense. Targeted Small group intervention is provided for T2 and T3 students. T2 students will work in small groups with the classroom teacher on grade level standards and will be assigned work in Math IXL; T3 students will work in a smaller group with a math intervention teacher working on math number sense and assigned remediation lessons in DreamBox Learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using targeted small group instruction in response to intervention is proven to have a high effective size of 1.29 and general small group at .47. Classroom discussion, like number talks, has an effect size of .82. Using math manipulatives increases students understanding of math place value and number sense overall. The math programs provide math fluency practice.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Placement into small groups based on testing data from PM3 of the previous school year, focusing on T2 and T3 intervention.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** September, 2023

Train teachers in the use of Braining Camp manipulatives, Reflex, Desmos, and Number Talks.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** October, 2023

Analyze data of student growth in FAST PM2 from PM1 and PM data points collected from T2 and T3 intervention groups and Dreambox Learning Data.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** March, 2024

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student Attendance/Engagement need to be increased for higher levels of learning, participation, and engagement within the virtual, live classroom.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

FLCCA will decrease the number of students with more than 10% absences in to 5% of our overall population.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Our attendance specialists will be sending 5 and 10 day letters for unexcused absences, teachers will send "we missed you emails" for missed live classes, students will be placed on an engagement tracker.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attendance contracts will be written with Learning Coaches and the Social Worker or attendance specialist. Administrator calls/emails will be sent that attendance is mandatory for continued enrollment. Strong Start calls and Enduring Connect Calls by the homeroom teacher builds the rapport with the families to ensure the Learning Coach assists the students with attending the live classes.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for increasing attendance is a direct correlation between positive attendance and grades. When the school monitors attendance and keeps in close communication with the family, it results in the Learning Coaches ensuring the students are online.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify the students with a lower % of attendance, 10% or higher, from the previous school year and create an attendance/engagement tracker and add those students to the tracker. Then, add students to the tracker throughout the semester for monitoring

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** By the end of the 1st Quarter

Weekly updates to the tracker of students that have missed more than 10 days in a semester. Attendance letters, emails and calls will be sent to the legal guardian and the learning coach.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** The attendance specialist will send these letters.

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be to increase the % Proficiency of ELA and Math in our Black/African American Student Population.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase student achievement and learning growth in our B/AA students to at least 40% Proficient in Math and ELA.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FLCCA will monitor the growth toward ELA standards mastery through Ongoing Progress Monitoring in PM1 and PM2 of the FAST and the final PM3, collecting data points and filtering by ESSA subgroup to ensure our B/AA students are making progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Primary Tier 3 Students will be getting a double dose of SIPP for Foundational Phonics skills, as well as Heggerty for phonemic awareness. Interventions at the higher grade levels will be with a intervention teacher running targeted small groups focused on Pre-reading/Close Reading to build comprehension and vocabulary instruction. Students will be provided instruction and practice through MindPlay for Tier 2 and Tier 3 support as well. In math, our T3 students will be working through the intervention program Dreambox Math and working in small group for remediation in number sense and fact fluency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students need a small group instruction in foundational reading skills as proven by the Science of Reading. Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and fluency are the foundational skills they need to master before they can read to learn. As they master foundational skills, students need the small group instruction using pre-reading strategies, close reads focusing on mastery of language and comprehension. In math they need a remediation program to identify and close the gap in math foundational skills.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that qualify for remediation through instruction/intervention and create small groups within the master schedule

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** After all students have taken FAST PM1, around the 1st week of September.

Provide small group instruction 3-4 days a week for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 students for remediation in reading and math.

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** Throughout the school year.

Identification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that qualify for remediation through instruction/intervention and create small groups within the master schedule

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** After all students have taken FAST PM1, around the 1st week of September.

Provide small group instruction 3-4 days a week for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 students for remediation in reading and math.

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** Throughout the school year.

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be to increase the % Proficiency of ELA and Math in our Hispanic Student Population.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase student achievement and learning growth in our Hispanic students to at least 42% Proficient in Math and ELA.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FLCCA will monitor the growth toward ELA standards mastery through Ongoing Progress Monitoring in PM1 and PM2 of the FAST and the final PM3, collecting data points and filtering by ESSA subgroup to ensure our Hispanic students are making progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Primary Tier 3 Students will be getting a double dose of SIPP for Foundational Phonics skills, as well as Heggerty for phonemic awareness. Interventions at the higher grade levels will be with a intervention teacher running targeted small groups focused on Pre-reading/Close Reading to build comprehension and vocabulary instruction. Students will be provided instruction and practice through IXL and iReady for Tier 2 and

Tier 3 support as well. In math, our T3 students will be working through the intervention program Dreambox Math and working in small group for remediation in number sense and fact fluency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students need a small group instruction in foundational reading skills as proven by the Science of Reading. Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and fluency are the foundational skills they need to master before they can read to learn. As they master foundational skills, students need the small group instruction using pre-reading strategies, close reads focusing on mastery of language and comprehension. In math they need a remediation program to identify and close the gap in math foundational skills.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that qualify for remediation through instruction/intervention and create small groups within the master schedule

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** After all students have taken FAST PM2, around the 1st week of February.

Provide small group instruction 3-4 days a week for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 students for remediation in reading and math.

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** Throughout the school year.



**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be to increase the % Proficiency of ELA and Math in our Multi-Racial Student Population.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase student achievement and learning growth in our Multi-Racial students to at least 42% Proficient in Math and ELA.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FLCCA will monitor the growth toward ELA standards mastery through Ongoing Progress Monitoring in PM1 and PM2 of the FAST and the final PM3, collecting data points and filtering by ESSA subgroup to ensure our Multi-Racial students are making progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Primary Tier 3 Students will be getting a double dose of SIPP's for Foundational Phonics skills, as well as Heggerty for phonemic awareness. Interventions at the higher grade levels will be with a intervention teacher running targeted small groups focused on Pre-reading/Close Reading to build comprehension and vocabulary instruction. Students will be provided instruction and practice through IXL and iReady for Tier 2 and

Tier 3 support as well. In math, our T3 students will be working through the intervention program Dreambox Math and working in small group for remediation in number sense and fact fluency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students need a small group instruction in foundational reading skills as proven by the Science of Reading. Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and fluency are the foundational skills they need to master before they can read to learn. As they master foundational skills, students need the small group instruction using pre-reading strategies, close reads focusing on mastery of language and comprehension. In math they need a remediation program to identify and close the gap in math foundational skills.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that qualify for remediation through instruction/intervention and create small groups within the master schedule

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** After all students have taken FAST PM 2, around the 1st week of February.

Provide small group instruction 3-4 days a week for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 students for remediation in reading and math.

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** Throughout the school year.

**#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus will be to increase the % Proficiency of ELA and Math in our SWD Student Population.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase student achievement and learning growth in our SWD students to at least 42% Proficient in Math and ELA.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

FLCCA will monitor the growth toward ELA standards mastery through Ongoing Progress Monitoring in PM1 and PM2 of the FAST and the final PM3, collecting data points and filtering by ESSA subgroup to ensure our SWD students are making progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Primary Tier 3 Students will be getting a double dose of SIPP for Foundational Phonics skills, as well as Heggerty for phonemic awareness. Interventions at the higher grade levels will be with a intervention teacher running targeted small groups focused on Pre-reading/Close Reading to build comprehension and vocabulary instruction. Students will be provided instruction and practice through IXL and iReady for Tier 2 and

Tier 3 support as well. In math, our T3 students will be working through the intervention program Dreambox Math and working in small group for remediation in number sense and fact fluency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students need a small group instruction in foundational reading skills as proven by the Science of Reading. Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and fluency are the foundational skills they need to master before they can read to learn. As they master foundational skills, students need the small group instruction using pre-reading strategies, close reads focusing on mastery of language and comprehension. In math they need a remediation program to identify and close the gap in math foundational skills.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identification of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students that qualify for remediation through instruction/intervention and create small groups within the master schedule

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** After all students have taken FAST PM2, around the 1st week of February.

Provide small group instruction 3-4 days a week for Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 students for remediation in reading and math.

**Person Responsible:** Jerry Hulshult (jhulshult@k12.com)

**By When:** Throughout the school year.

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

School is not receiving additional funds due to ATSI designation.

FLCCA has utilized operating FEFP funds, Title IV, and other Grants to target various software programs and tutoring to support students. For example, the ARP Targeted Math Grant was used to implement Dreambox, Reflex Math, and to provide PD for Teachers at the FCTE conference.

### Budget to Support Areas of Focus

#### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

#### Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No